



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,440	01/10/2002	Costas D. Maranas	P05468US1	1336
27407	7590	01/15/2009		
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. ATTN: PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY 801 GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721			EXAMINER	
			CLOW, LORI A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/043,440	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MARANAS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Lori A. Clow	<b>Art Unit</b> 1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-16, 19-27 and 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-16, 19-27, and 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' response, filed 7 October 2008, has been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 19-27, and 30-39 are currently pending and under exam herein.

Claims 9, 17, 18, 28 and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 34-39 are newly added.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101-Non-statutory Subject Matter**

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 19-27, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This is a new grounds of rejection as necessitated by the recent decision in *In re Bilski*.

Claims 1, 6, 23, 30 and 33 are drawn to a method for modeling cellular metabolism of an organism comprising the steps of constructing a flux balance analysis model, applying logic constraints comprising a regulation matrix, and providing an output to a user of said available flux distribution.

As stated in MPEP 2106, section IV if the claims are found to cover a judicial exception then the claims will be evaluated for providing a practical application for the judicial exception

(i.e., Law of Nature, Natural Phenomenon, or an Abstract Idea). This is in line with the recent decision in *In re Bilski* (Federal Circuit, 2008). In the instant case, the claims are drawn to an abstract idea and therefore must be evaluated further for providing a practical application of the judicial exception. A practical application is claimed if the claimed invention physically transforms an article or physical object to a different state or thing, or if the claimed invention otherwise produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result. In the instant case, a physical transformation of matter is not provided, as the instant claims merely provide steps of *in silico* information manipulation. Therefore, none of said steps result in a physical transformation of matter such that the whole of the claim is statutory.

As such, the claims must be further evaluated for providing the practical application. One way to do this is for the claim to produce a concrete, tangible and useful result. The focus is not on the steps taken to achieve a particular result, but rather the final result achieved by the claimed invention. A claim may be statutory where it recites a result that is concrete (i.e. reproducible), tangible (i.e. communicated to a user), and useful (i.e. a specific and substantial). In the instant case the steps of "providing an output to a user" **does** provide a tangible result that is useful to one skilled in the art and thus provides a practical application.

However, in addition to the facts set forth above that state that a claim must provide a practical application, the claim **must also meet** the machine-or-transformation test in order to be eligible under 35 USC 101 as statutory subject matter (*In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Federal Circuit, 2008)). In other words, the prohibition on patenting abstract ideas has two distinct aspects: (1) when an abstract concept has no claimed practical application, it is not patentable; (2) while an abstract concept **may have a practical application**, a claim reciting an

algorithm or abstract idea can state statutory subject matter only if it is embodied in, operates on, transforms, or otherwise is tied to another class of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 (i.e. a machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). (*Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ 673, 1972), as clarified in *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Federal Circuit, 2008) the test for a method claim is whether the claimed method is (1) tied to a particular machine or apparatus or (2) transforms a particular article to a different state or thing.

In the instant case, method claims 1, 6, 23, 30 and 33 are not so tied to another statutory class of invention because the **method** steps that are critical to the invention are "not tied to any **particular apparatus or machine**" and therefore do not meet the machine-or-transformation test as set forth in *In re Bilski* 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Federal Circuit, 2008).

In addition to the above analysis regarding the said method claims, it is noted that the system claims (claim 19 and those dependent therefrom), now amended to recite "a computer readable medium having stored thereon a system" do not meet the test for providing a practical application because the recited computer readable medium does nothing more than run a method that is considered non-statutory. The system fails to provide a practical application, in the form of a concrete, tangible, or useful result and is therefore non-statutory.

Further, the recited computer-readable medium of claim 19 is drawn to non-statutory subject matter further because a computer-readable medium reads on carrier waves, which read on transitory propagating signals which are not proper patentable subject matter because they do not fit within any of the four statutory categories of invention (*In re Nujiten*, Federal Circuit. 2007).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a NEW MATTER rejection.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite a "computer readable medium having stored thereon a system for modeling cellular metabolism". The specification provides no such support, nor has Applicant pointed to support for a computer readable medium limitation. The specification is generally drawn to a method or system for *in silico* or bioinformatic modeling of cellular metabolism at page 1. However, the specification does not provide disclosure of a specific computer readable medium having stored thereon a system. Therefore, the claim amendments are deemed new matter.

**Conclusion**

No claims are allowed.

**Inquiries**

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG

Art Unit: 1631

30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central Fax Center Number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0715. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

January 15, 2009

/Lori A. Clow/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631